DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 800 SP 030 090

AUTHOR	Oja, Sharon Nodie
TITLE	Future Prospects for Collaborative Models of Teacher Education: A Collaborative Approach to Leadership in Supervision.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	30 Oct 87
CONTRACT	400-85-1056
NOTE	18p.; Paper presented at the Regional Holmes Group Fall Conference (Boston, MA, October 30, 1987). For a related document, see ED 292 754.
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Action Research; *College School Cooperation; Developmental Stages; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Leadership Training; *Principals; Program Development; *Supervisory Training
IDENTIFIERS	Holmes Group Report

ABSTRACT

The Collaborative Supervision Project involving the University of New Hampshire and several public schools is described. This paper addresses the university teacher education interest in enhancing supervisory effectiveness and the teacher education faculty during the initial planning stages and the development, demonstration, and dissemination years of the project. A description is given of the context of the collaborating school district. A directive from the superintendent to the principals in the district to investigate different models of supervision resulted in two years of self-study of supervisory effectiveness. This led to the school district's interest in joining with the teacher education faculty to mutually develop a program which would address supervision issues. Successful practices are described and the way in which the project addresses some of the Holmes Group goals is summarized. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED293800

FUTURE PROSPECTS FOR COLLABORATIVE MODELS OF TEACHER EDUCATION: A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION.

NORTHEAST REGIONAL HOLMES GROUP
FALL 1987 CONFERENCE
BOSTON, MA. OCTOBER 30, 1987.

Sharon Nodie Oja
Associate Professor of Education
University of New Hampshire

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. N. Oja

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP030090

The preparation of this paper was supported in part by the Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Contract No. 400-85-1056. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not represent those of the Department of Education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Today I am representing not only the University of New Hampshire but also our collaborators, the teachers and administrators in School Administrative Unit #56. Our project, A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION (Oja and Ham, 1987), is a school and university collaborative effort to enhance supervisory effectiveness. The SAU #56/ UNH collaborative supervision project is one of 29 funded proposals in the OERI Teacher Education Development/Demonstration Program (TEDD).

I want to address a Holmes Group statement that there is a lot that schools of education can do to help schools in their efforts to restructure and take advantage of differential talent. Today I will describe the Collaborative Supervision Project in terms of the suggested reforms in Teacher Education. Our project is three pronged, based in three areas of knowledge in teacher education: first, adult cognitive developmental stages, second, alternative models of supervision, and third, the process of collaborative action research. I have brought with me an accompanying paper (Oja and Ham, 1987) which provides you with an overview of collaborative action research which forms the process of our project. The paper also describes the content as it is evidenced in each of the three years (or phases) of the project. I will highlight these areas.

In my remarks I will address the university teacher education interest in enhancing supervisory effectiveness and the teacher education faculty involvement during the initial planning stages and the development, demonstration, and dissemination years of the project. I will also describe the context of the collaborating school district. The superintendent's directive to the principals in the district to investigate different models of supervision, and their resulting two years of self study of supervisory effectiveness, set the stage for the school district's

particular interest in joining with the teacher education faculty to mutually develop a program which would address supervision issues. Finally I will describe successful practices and outcomes to date, summarizing the way in which this project addresses some of the Holmes Group goals.

The UNH Five Year Teacher Education Program

Twelve years ago we made a drastic change in our program - and moved to an extended five year teacher preparation program. Our program, as a model of a 5 year extended MAT/MED in Teacher Education, is cited in the 1985 report of the National Commission for Excellance in Teacher Education. Our Director of Teacher Education, Dr. Michael Andrew, has reported on the program in four major articles (Andrew, 1981, 1983, 1985, 1986). Some copies of his 1986 "Status Report" on the program after 12 years are available here today as well as his working draft of "Lessons from Experience" in implementing our five year program. From the beginning of the process of change in teacher education at UNH in 1969, **Teacher Leadership** has been one of the central objectives. Specifically, the UNH program emphasizes that teacher leaders in the schools should be expected to play a major role in preservice instruction of teachers, in continued inservice education and staff development, and in initiating curriculum change. Our 5 Year Integrated Masters Program seeks to develop teacher leaders and begins with an undergraduate early field experience course.

The undergraduate course, EXPLORING TEACHING, begins our Program. Classroom teachers have always had a great responsibility in helping undergraduate students, mostly in their sophomore year, to explore teaching and to decide whether or not teaching is a realistic career choice.

This course involves 65 hours of classroom experience. The course serves as an initial screening, with recommendations needed from the classroom practicing teacher and the university faculty supervisor in order for the undergraduate student to go on in the teacher education program. (More recently this course is also enrolled by juniors, seniors, and post-BA students who are finding teaching to be a more attractive field.)

PROFESSIONAL COURSEWORK normally begins in the junior year and requires a minimum of four credits to be completed in each of four content areas of Pedogogical study required for state certification. Students begin to take professional coursework while they complete requirements for a Baccalaureate degree with an undergraduate major in a subject area related to the subject they will be teaching or, as is the choice of many elementary candidates, a major in child development, psychology, or sociology. There is no undergraduate major in education.

A POST BA INTERNSHIP AND GRADUATE STUDY complete the program and consist of a year long post-baccalaureate internship as well as graduate study related to one's chosen area or level of teaching. Graduate work completes the requirements in professional course work, includes extra math and reading requirements for elementary teachers, and includes a possible 12 credit hour graduate concentration for secondary students in their subject area.

Common Supervision Concerns in the University and the Schools

During the 1984 and 1985 the University Teacher Education Committee discussed the issue of intern supervision and the desire for greater university-school collaboration in the supervisory leadership phases of the program. The Teacher Education Committee directed its attention to the goal of encouraging practicing teachers to take on more responsibility

and supervision leadership in the preparation of the graduate interns. A second goal was to enlarge the university supervisor's role in the triad model to working more collegially and continually with the cooperating teacher. A new seminar was designed and offered free for graduate credit to cooperating teachers by the UNH Director of Field Experiences, in response to teachers' requests for additional supervisory expertise. Some practicing teachers in the local schools who were cooperating teachers for graduate student teaching interns took advantage of this course titled "Seminar in Supervision." The Collaborative Supervison Project proposal to OERI is another of the ways the university began to concentrate on improving the supervision experiences of interns, utilizing cooperating teachers' expertise and stated interest in becoming better supervisors, and broadening the university supervisors relationship with the practicing teacher.

The timing was right with the administration in local school district, too. During 1983 to 1985, the local school superintendent (SAU #56) had urged all principals to investigate alternative supervision models. The district principal's meetings were devoted to reading Glatthorn's (1984) Differentiated Supervison book (among others) and viewing ASCD supervision video tapes. The administrators were studying how they might use differentiated supervision strategies with their staffs.

The Collaborative Supervision Proposal

It was at this time in 1985 that the OERI Request for Proposals came out Dr. Maryellen Ham and I designed a program that could address supervision issues of both the school and the univeristy. At that time she was Learning Center Director and Teacher Consultant in the school district

and I was Chairperson of the university Teacher Education Committee. She and I had each worked with school groups using a problem solving strategy called Collaborative Action Research to address local concerns. I had worked primarily with teachers and Dr. Ham had worked with principals. We decided to combine our efforts, utilize the good timing in terms of the university teacher education interests and the school system interests, and go one step further, working toward mutual school-university goals. Thus, with university, school administration, and teacher support, we wrote the OERI proposal which was funded for a three year period.

In recruiting participants for Phase 1 of this Project, all of the elementary principals from SAU #56 were invited to participate in a Collaborative Supervision Leadership Group to investigate supervisory models. The decision to focus initially on SAU #56 allowed both univeristy and public school staff to focus upon the common goals and philosophy of a single school district. Because of this district's proximity to the UNH campus and because its Superintendent strongly supports school-university collaboration and views teacher supervision as a prime concern, the decision to focus in this school district also enhanced the Project's likelihood for success.

Critical Aspects

The Collaborative Supervision project provided substantial changes from the existing intern supervision practices at UNH and in the country at large. It also provided substantial changes in the variety of teacher supervision/evaluation systems in practice among many of our school principals. This project had the endorsement and approval of key administrators and university staff responsible for management of teacher education. It also had the endorsement of the SAU #56

superintendent, principals, and interested teachers.

As a school-university effort, the Project Director, being situated in the school system, had the opportunity to assess the climate of the schools, observe the interface between the project and the school, and ask teachers, principals, and superintendent to reflect on the impact of the project on the participants and schools at various times. Likewise, the Principal Investigator, being situated at the university, had the same opportunity to get reactions from the university supervisors and other faculty at various times in the project. Project planning and activities included representatives from the university and the school district, including faculty and school practitioners.

Content of Adult Developmental Stages

The basic assumption in adult cognitive developmental stage theory is that people behave according to the level of complexity of their thinking capabilities. Those at less complex levels tend to exhibit rigid, concrete and less adaptive behavior in problem solving situations. The opposite is the case for people who process experience at more complex levels. The need for cognitive flexibility is crucial in choosing how to organize instruction and respond to individual needs.

Since learning to supervise an intern could provide a major opportunity for more complex thinking and roletaking by a cooperating teacher, learning that task of supervision is one of the primary objectives of this project. In addition, the Project provides school principals with the opportunity to enhance their repertoire of alternative models of supervision (one of their stated goals) while enabling them to promote both their own cognitive development and that of the teachers with whom they work.

In the context of educational supervision, differentiated models of supervision, the ability to clarify instructional problems, to determine alternative solutions, and to plan new courses of action all demand abstract thinking. It appears that educators who possess such problem solving skills, and who can judge the consequences of alternative actions, are more effective in meeting the needs of individuals. Likewise, educators who have not developed such abstract thinking ability are limited in discovering alternative solutions or in defining new courses of action.

A troubling aspect has been documented in the development and fostering of abstract thinking by Kohlberg and Turiel (1971). According to their research, the stimulus for helping people move into higher stages of abstract reasoning comes primarily from the interaction with others who are functioning at more advanced stages. The assumption is at more advanced stages, people can promote the conditions, set the environment, offer the support, and provide the probing questions or ideas to stimulate and challenge the thinking of those at lower stages. The research among preservice and inservice teachers, however, sugggests that the higher abstract thinkers either left teaching or regressed to operating at lower cognitive stages within the confines of the school context, while those at lower levels did not increase their abstract thinking ability (Kohlberg, 1971; Wilkins, 1980; Harvey, 1970; Higgins, 1983).

My previous work with teachers suggested that the problem-solving process of collaborative action research in schools was both a vehicle for stimulating adult cognitive development and a process for linking theory with practice (Oja and Pine, 1983). Also it suggested that 1) qualitative differences exist in the developmental stages of adult educators; 2) group interaction and collaboration initiate cognitive development; and 3) open

communication and supportive, collegial relationships act as deliberate psychological interventions promoting individual learning (Oja and Springhall, 1978; Oja, 1980; Oja and Ham, 1984).

It is important to note that teachers can be involved in their own developmental growth ... and that knowledge of different adult stages of development and alternative models of supervision can help to focus strengths and weaknesses, be a starting point in analyzing interactions with others, and also provide a map for further learning and development.

Three Phases of the Collaborative Supervision Project

See Figure 1 as an overview to the three phases of the project.

Phase 1: Development

Project staff met first with all elementary and middle school principals for six meetings in the fall of the first year. Second, in the spring of that year the staff and principals met with all interested teachers to set up collaborative action research groups in which all could learn the content of stages of adult development and differentiated models of supervision. Teachers, who were interested in the opportunity to learn about themselves, investigated their own adult development in terms of ego, moral, conceptual and interpersonal dimensions. All teachers and principals in Phase 1 of the project took the opportunity to analyze their interactions with supervisees. Some also analyzed their interactions with supervisors. See Oja and Ham (1987) for references on ego, moral, conceptual, interpersonal dimensions of development.

University supervision and administraction faculty became resources to provide the Principal Leadership Group (PLG) in the fall and the three Teacher Supervision Groups (TSG) in the spring with information in the two content areas and strategies for matching supervision models with

individual supervisee needs. The project staff served as facilitators or moderators of meetings in the process of collaborative action reserach. Both the Principal Leadership Group and the Teacher Supervision Groups focused on alternative models of supervision: clinical, peer/collegial, scientific, human resources supervision, developmental supervision, or differentiated supervision. (See Oja and Ham, 1987, for references.) The Principal Leadership Group discussed questions about their experience in applying and matching any of these supervision models with teachers. Teacher Supervision Groups focused on clinical supervision with interns and their own experience (or lack of experience) with alternative forms of supervision in their interactions with their own school administrators.

Important during Phase 1 was the initiating of a school-university **Task Force on Improved Supervison.** Representatives of the principals group, the teachers group, the university supervisors and teacher education administrators, met regularly with project staff to discuss issues in collaborative supervision in relation to both school and university goals.

Phase 2: Demonstration.

Questions and study in the Principal Leadership Group and Teacher Supervision Groups in Year 2 focused on: trying out different supervision strategies, confidence in a supervisory role with interns, and then matching supervision strategies to the individual needs of their interns or other supervisees.

In preparation for year 2, the UNH director of field supervision needed to be intricately involved in assigning interns to project teachers -- with the intention of cluster placement of up to five interns per school building. Problems in placement arose which led to concerns about intern

placement in general and the need for more cluster placements. A number of project teachers who were trained and wanted interns couldn't get them. A creative solution was reached: placement of thirty-three undergraduate Exploring teachers was made to the rest of the project teachers. In addition, four interested project teachers took on the additional role of Course Collaborators with the university faculty member in the weekly seminar for The Exploring Teaching course.

The inclusion of the Exploring Teaching undergraduate students was an unexpected but quite important facet of the second year. First, it denotes the excellent cooperation of the Director of Teacher Education who was willing to make unexpected changes to benefit teachers in the school district. Second, at the TSG meetings in discussions about supervision of exploring undergrads versus graduate teaching interns, the teachers were more clearly able to distinguish different adult cognitive-developmental stages. The teachers then began to see the need for specific kinds of differential supervision within the range of interns themselves.

Phase 3 - Dissemmination

Year 3 continued the collaborative action research process in the TSGs and their content applications. Findings are being disseminated regionally and nationally. There are efforts in the university and the schools to institutionalize successful practices as we move toward year four, without project funds. Also underway are efforts at the university to extend the model to the secondary level.

OUTCOMES

As outcomes of the Collaborative Supervision Project thus far, I mention

the following:

1) teachers are finding the opportunity for kinds of differentiated staffing which helps them to keep growing in the profession. For instance, cooperating teachers of interns are taking on additional supervisiory roles and responsibiliites which include cluster meeting on a regular basis with all cooperating teachers and interns in their school to discuss curriculum, view together in a group the videotapes of their own teaching, and so forth. One teacher has taken on a significant additional role with responsibilities as a Cooperating Teacher/Intern Field Coordinator acting as an organizing, mobilizing force, among the cooperating teachers and interns in the school and as a liason from her school district to the university. Four teachers have taken on additional roles and responsibilities as Course Collaborators with the university faculty for the Exploring Teaching seminar meeting weekly with undergrads to explore teaching as a career. These examples are all additional roles which teachers have the opportunity to take on without leaving their love of classroom teaching behind.

2) In organizational changes thus far, the university education department has begun a plan to recognize the worth of additional skills of cooperating teachers as trained supervisors with higher honorariums and provide a significant reimbursement for the school level position of field coordinator of cooperating teachers and interns.

3) Representatives of principals, teachers, supervising faculty, director of field experiences, and project staff continued on the **School-University Task Force on Improved Supervision**. First, it created two different school based models for cooperating teacher supervision which are now being piloted, and next, it initiated the drafting of a set of **Supervision Competences** with behavioral

indicators which were developed by teachers and principals in one Teacher Supervision Group, tried out with all Teacher Supervision Groups, and being used by project participants this year.

4) There is a strong commitment now from the UNH Director of Field Experiences in the **cluster placement** of elementary level interns in project schools for next year. Also the university supervising faculty are interested in extending and tailoring the cluster placement and collaborative supervision model with additional elementary schools and with some secondary schools.

Reform Innovations: How the Collaborative Supervision Effort Addresses Holmes Group Goals

Let me summarize by pointing out the ways in which this collaborative supervision project addresses some of the major goals of both the Holmes and Carnegie reports:

1. In helping to make the education of teachers intellectually sound, this collaborative project, which includes a strong theoretical base, is committed to focusing clinical experience on the systematic development of practice and experimentation. Our full year internship at the graduate level is in harmony with the reform standards. Looking even further to the internship, we are finding ways in which cooperating teachers can add their significant expertise in this clinical experience.

2. This project is committed to recognize differences in knowledge, skill and commitment among teachers. In the language of the Holmes report, we are identifying career professional teachers, in the Carnegie language, lead teachers, those teachers capable of assuming not only full

responsibility for the classroom but also for certain aspects of the administration of the school and even the university - to provide active leadership in the redesign of schools and programs and in helping their colleagues to uphold high standards of learning and teaching. The cooperating teachers in the project are taking on a variety of additional significant responsibilities related to the field supervision experiences not only of graduate interns, but also undergraduate exploring teachers, and even with their peers/colleagues in the school. The field coordinator of cooperating teachers and interns) is working closely with her peers and also acting as a liason to the university education department. This differentiated structure increases the rewards of teaching and the opportunities available for professional advancement and personal development for the teachers themselves. The collaborative supervision project is one example of restructuring the teaching force to foster collegial styles of decisionmaking among professional teachers, to allow a variety of approaches to school leadership, and to take responsibility for supervising the work of additional staff with a range of skills and experience. All this creates a more professional environment for teaching.

3. One of the guiding principles of this project was to connect the university teacher education program even more closely with the schools. We agree that the professionalization of teaching depends on the contributions that both teachers and administrators and teacher education faculty make to the creation of knowledge about the profession. Collaborative (action) research processes are one tested way in which school and university educators can form collegial relationships beyond their immediate working environments and grow intellectually throughout their careers. Collaborative research processes are also a way to improve

teacher education by utilization of teachers' contributions to pedagogical knowledge and to reflective practice. The collaborative supervision project is a working partnership among university faculty members, practicing teachers, and administrators. The collaborative supervision project is based on principles identified by the Holmes Group as reciprocity (the mutual exchange and benefit between research and practice), experimentation (a willingness to try and carefully evaluate new forms of practice and structure), and diversity (commitment to the development of teaching and supervising strategies for a broad range of learners with different backgrounds, developmental abilities, and learning styles.)

4. Finally, The collaborative supervision project is focused on making schools better places in which teachers can work and learn.
Teachers and principals are working together on the supervision project. Principals are recognizing that utilizing a repetoire of alternative supervision and evaluation strategies works better because differential supervision provides appropriate supports and challenges to meet the career teacher or professional teacher's individual needs for both professional and personal learning and continued adult cognitive-development. Finally, and I can't stres this point enough, teachers are finding a professional way to talk with teachers about teaching and supervision. Interns are finding a diverse cluster of other interns and cooperating teachers with whom they can talk regularly during the school days about pedagogy and content of teaching as they complete an internship and master's program aimed to develop them as teacher leaders.

References

Andrew, Michael D. (1981, May/June). A five year teacher education program: Successes and challenges. Journal of Teacher Education.

Andrew, Michael D. (1983, January/February). The characteristics of students in a five year teacher education program. Journal of Teacher Education.

Andrew, Michael D. (1986, February). The University of New Hampshire's five year teacher education program: A status report after 12 years, 1974-1986. Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire (mimeographed).

Glatthorn, Allen. (1984). Differentiated Supervision. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Harvey, O.J.(1970). Beliefs and Behavior: Some implications for education. Science Teacher, 37, 10-14, 73.

Hunt, David E. (1980). Teachers' adaptation to students. In B. Joyce (Ed.), Flexibility in teaching. New York: Longman.

Higgins, Ann (1983, November). Recent findings in adult moral development. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Moral Education, Boston, Ma.

Kohlberg, Lawrence (1971). Stages of moral development as a basis for moral education. In C. M. Beck, et al. (Eds.), Moral Education: Interdisciplinary approaches (pp. 23-93). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kohlberg, Lawrence and Turiel, Elliot (1971). Moral development and moral education. In G. Lesser (Ed.), Psychology and Educational Practice. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, and Co.

Oja, Sharon N. (1980). Adult development is implicit in staff development. Journal of Staff Development, 1(2), 8-55.

Oja, Sharon N. and Ham, Maryellen C. (1984). A cognitive-developmental approach to collaborative action research with teachers. Teachers College Record, 86(1), 171-192.

Oja, Sharon N. and Ham, Maryellen C. (1987). A collaborative approach to leadership in supervision. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Washington D.C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 248 227)

Oja, Sharon N. and Pine, Gerald J. (1983). A two year study of teacher stages of development in relation to collaborative action research in schools: Final Report. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 248 227)

Oja, Sharon N. and Sprinthall, Norman A. (1978). Psychological and moral development for teachers. In N. A. Sprinthall and R. A. Mosher (Eds), Value development...as the aim of education (pp. 117-134). Schenectady, NY: Character Research Press.

Competencies and Behavioral Indicators in Educational Supervision in three areas: Adult development, instructional supervision, and Collaboration. Developed by a Teacher Supervision Group of the OERI funded project, A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION. For further information contact: Dr. Maryellen C. Ham, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Colchester, VT. 05446, or Dr. Sharon Nodie Oja, Associate Professor of Education, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH 03824.